



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 2450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09.614,374	07 12 2000	GOSUKE OSHIMA	TY-001	2254

1473 7590 05 06 2003

FISH & NEAVE  
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
50TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

VIGUSHIN, JOHN B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/614,374	OSHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John B. Vigushin	2827	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John B. Vigushin (Examiner) (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Vinay Joshi (Applicant's Attorney) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 April 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: Applicant's Proposed Amendment to Claim 14

Identification of prior art discussed: Mattei et al. (US 5,694,300; Kazle (US 5,847,930)


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Attachment

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

**Attachment to Interview Summary**

Mr. Joshi and the Examiner have agreed that the proposed amendment to Claim 14 **appears** to overcome the rejection relying upon Mattei et al. in the Final Office Action mailed 23 October 2002 with the proposed limitation "a first substrate including **a plurality of separable substrates** linked in the form of a matrix" (bold emphasis by the Examiner). Mattei et al. teaches Applicant's proposed limitation, "the resin layer formed over the entire first generally planar surface" (col.2: 56-60), but does not teach a plurality of separable substrates; rather, Mattei et al. teaches a multichip unitary modular substrate 10 comprising four electrically interconnected multichip regions (Fig. 2; col.2: 35-41), wherein singulation or separation is clearly neither accommodated by nor contemplated for the disclosed structure.

Mr. Joshi and the Examiner have agreed that the proposed amendment to Claim 14 **appears** to overcome the rejection relying upon Kazle in the First Office Action mailed 13 March 2002 with **the combination** of the proposed limitations: 1) "*the first substrate having first and second generally planar surfaces, wherein the first generally planar surface is parallel to the second generally planar surface,*" 2) "*a resin layer formed on the first generally planar surface to surround the electronic part, the resin layer formed over the entire first generally planar surface*" **and** 3) "*a plurality of terminal electrodes disposed only on the second generally planar surface and electrically coupled to the electronic part.*" In the first embodiment of Kazle (Figs. 1-7), the resin layer 85 is formed over the entire first generally planar surface of substrate 11 but the electrodes are formed **in** the substrate holes 40a,b,c and 60a,b,c (Figs. 3A, 4A and 5;


col.5: 19-26) and not "disposed only on the second generally planar surface" as required by the proposed limitation. In the second embodiment of Kazle (Figs. 8-11), the resin layer 85 is formed on the first generally planar surface of substrate 12 and the plurality of electrodes **are also formed on the first generally planar surface of substrate 12** (Fig. 8; col.6: 53-57) and not "disposed only on the second generally planar surface," as required by the proposed limitation.

Accordingly, the above-proposed amendments to Claim 14 **appear** to distinguish over Mattei et al. and Kazle, as indicated above, and further **appear** to distinguish over the remaining prior art of record. For now, the Examiner will look favorably upon the above-discussed proposed amendment to Claim 14 as a positive step toward patentability. However, the final decision of patentability will be determined upon receipt of Applicant's official amended Response, at which time, a final review of the prior art of record as well as an updated and extended search will be conducted by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Vigushin whose telephone number is 703-308-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM Mo-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7382 for regular communications and 703-308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

  
John B. Vigushin  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2827

jbv  
April 25, 2003